arXiv:1209.1307v2 [math.CO] 12 Sep 2012

INFINITE ASYMPTOTIC COMBINATORICS

MENACHEM KOJMAN

Abstract. The following combinatorial theorems, some of which were known for every finite n in all infinite structures, are proved in ZFC for every infinite cardinal ν in all sufficiently large structures. (a) A new extension of Miller's theorem [18]. (b) An upper bound of ρ^+ on the list-conflict-free number of ρ-uniform families of sets which satisfy $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ for cardinals ν and $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(n)$. (c) An upper bound of $\beth_\omega(\nu)$ on the coloring number of a graph with list-chromatic number ν. (d) An extension to arbitrarily large cardinals of Komjáth's comparison theorem [15] for $\aleph_0$-uniform families of sets. (e) The extensions of Miller's theorem which were proved with the GCH by Erdős and Hajnal in the 1960s, and by Komjáth in the 1980s [2, 3, 14] and with the weaker axiom $A(\nu, \rho)$ by Hajnal, Juhász and Shelah [10].

The proofs rely on a consequence of Shelah's theorem in cardinal arithmetic [23], by which every infinite cardinal satisfies with all sufficiently larger cardinals certain useful arithmetic relations that generalize the relation of finite cardinals to infinite ones.

1. Introduction

> *'When you say "hill,"' the Queen interrupted, 'I could show you hills, in comparison with which you'd call that a valley.'*
>
> *The Red Queen,* Through the Looking-Glass.

1.1. **Shelah's new arithmetic finiteness.**

Infinite powers are not decidable in ZFC, but finite powers are. The equation

$$\lambda^n = \lambda \tag{1}$$

holds for all $n > 0$ and infinite λ. This fact is useful. It implies that the closure of infinite subsets of a structure under countably many finit-place operation has the same cardinality as the subset, or, in other words, the equations (1) imply the Skolem-Löwenheim theorem.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E04; 03E05; 03E75; 05C15; 05C63.

Key words and phrases. Shelah's revised GCH, proof in ZFC, family of sets, Property B, Miller's theorem, disjoint refinement, essentially disjoint family, coloring number, list-chromatic number, infinite graph, bipartite graph, conflict-free number, filtrations, Skolem-Löwenhem theorem.

The author was supported by a fellowship from the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, while working on this research.

As G. König discovered in 1904, for every cardinal $\aleph_\alpha$, the smallest limit cardinal above α, $\mu = \aleph_{\alpha+\omega}$, satisfies $\mu^\kappa > \mu$ for all $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$. Therefore, the following formula holds if and only if x is a finite cardinal and $x > 0$:

$$(\exists_\mu)(\forall_{y \geq \mu})\ y^x = y. \tag{2}$$

In particular, there is no general Skolem-Löwenheim theorem for structures with infinitary operations.

Recall now that $\beth_0(x) = x$, $\beth_{n+1}(x) = 2^{\beth_n(x)}$ and $\beth_\omega(x) = \lim_{n<\omega} \beth_n(x)$ for a cardinal x. As $\beth_\omega(x) = \aleph_0$ iff $x < \aleph_0$, the quantified μ in (2) can be replaced by the term $\beth_\omega(x)$. Also, $y^x = y$ can be strengthened to $y^z = y$ for all $0 < z < \beth_\omega(x)$. We get the following arithmetic definition of finite cardinals:

$$(\forall_{y \geq \beth_\omega(x)})(\forall_{0<z<\beth_\omega(x)})\ y^z = y. \tag{3}$$

Consider now the next formula in the free variable x:

$$(\forall_{y \geq \beth_\omega(x)})(\exists_{w<\beth_\omega(x)})(\forall_{w<z=\mathrm{cf} z<\beth_\omega(x)})\ y^{[z]} = y. \tag{4}$$

The operation $y^{[z]}$ is Shelah's *revised power* operation (see definition 2.1 below) which for finite z and infinite y is the same as y^z, and $z = \mathrm{cf} z$ means z is regular. So (4) is gotten from (3) by replacing "power" with "revised power" and weakening $\forall_{0<z<\beth_\omega(x)}$ to $\forall_{w<z=\mathrm{cf} z<\beth_\omega(x)}$ for some $w < \beth_\omega(x)$ which depends on y.

Shelah's remarkable revised GCH theorem [23] asserts that (4) holds for all infinite cardinals x.

The main point here is to use (5) below, which follows from (4), to prove in ZFC that for all infinite cardinals ν, all structures of size $\geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$ satisfy with ν combinatorial relations which all infinite structures satisfy with all finite n.

1.2. Statement of the results.

In Section 2 we deduce from Shelah's revised GCH theorem the following property of the *density* function $\mathcal{D}(y, x) = \min\{|\mathcal{D}| : \mathcal{D} \subseteq [y]^x \wedge (\forall_{w \in [y]^x})(\exists_{z \in \mathcal{D}})\, z \subseteq w\}$. For all cardinals x:

$$(\forall_{y \geq \beth_\omega(x)})(\forall^\infty_{n<\omega})\ D(y, \beth_n(x)) = y. \tag{5}$$

With (5) an asymptotic filtration theorem for anti-monotone set-functions is proved in Section 3.

Section 4 applies the filtration theorem to results about families of sets. Miller's theorem that a ρ-uniform family for infinite ρ which satisfy condition $C(\rho^+, n)$, that the intersection of every subfamily of size ρ^+ has cardinality $< n$, for some finite n, satisfies property B is extended yet again, following [2, 14, 10] to derive from the condition $C(\nu, \rho^+)$ a conclusion somewhat stronger than the existence of a disjoint refinement when $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$ (Theorem 4.7) in ZFC, for all cardinals ν. From this extension two new theorems follow: an upper bound of ρ^+ on the list-conflict-free number of a ρ-uniform family of sets which satisfies $C(\rho^+,\nu)$ for $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$ and an extension to uncountable cardinals of Komjáth's comparison theorem [14] for $\aleph_0$-uniform families. Also, as corollaries of Theorem 4.7 all additional axioms are eliminated from extensions of Miller's theorem which were proved by Erdős and Hajnal [2] and Komjáth [14] from the GCH, and by Hajnal, Juhász and Shelah in [10] from a weaker additional axiom.

Colorings of infinite graphs are discussed in Section 5. The GCH is eliminated from the infinite case in the classical Erdős-Hajnal theorem [3] on the connection between coloring numbers and bipartite graphs and a question of Alon of whether the coloring number of an infinite graph is bounded by some function in the graph's list-coloring number, as is the case for finite graph's by Alon's [1], is answered positively. As a corollary, an analog of Erdős and Hajnal's "compactness" of finite coloring number [3] is gotten for infinite coloring numbers.

2. Density relations

Definition 2.1 (Shelah's revised power)**.** *Let $\theta \leq \lambda$ be cardinals. A set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\theta$ is* weakly covering *if for every $X \in [\lambda]^\theta$ there exists $\mathcal{Y} \in [\mathcal{D}]^{<\theta}$ such that $X \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{Y}$.*

Shelah's revised θ-power of λ, *denoted $\lambda^{[\theta]}$, is the least cardinality of a weakly covering $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\theta$.*

Theorem 2.2 (Shelah's Revised GCH Theorem [23])**.** *For every strong limit cardinal μ, for all $\lambda \geq \mu$, for every sufficiently large regular $\theta < \mu$,*

$$\lambda^{[\theta]} = \lambda.$$

Definition 2.3 (Density)**.** *Let $\kappa \leq \lambda$ be cardinals. A set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\kappa$ is* dense in $[\lambda]^\kappa$ *if for every $X \in [\lambda]^\kappa$ there is $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$. The* density *$\mathcal{D}(\lambda,\kappa)$ of $[\lambda]^\kappa$ is the least cardinality of a dense $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\kappa$.*

Claim 2.4 (Basic properties of density)**.**
1. *If $X \subseteq Y$ and $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [Y]^\kappa$ is dense in $[Y]^\kappa$, then $\mathcal{D} \cap [X]^\kappa$ is dense in $[X]^\kappa$.*
2. *$\mathcal{D}(\lambda,\kappa)$ is increasing in λ.*
3. *If $\langle X_i : i < \theta\rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing, $\mathcal{D}_i \subseteq [X_i]^k$ is dense and $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \mathrm{cf}\kappa$ then $\bigcup_{i<\theta} \mathcal{D}_i$ is dense in $[\bigcup_{i<\theta} X_i]^\kappa$.*
4. *If $\lambda = \langle \lambda_i : i < \theta\rangle$ is increasing with limit λ, $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \mathrm{cf}\kappa$ and $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_i,\kappa) = \lambda_i$, then $\mathcal{D}(\lambda,\kappa) = \lambda$.*
5. *If $\mathrm{cf}\mu = \mathrm{cf}\kappa < \mu$ then $\mathcal{D}(\mu,\kappa) > \mu$.*

Proof. Item (1) is follows from the definition of density and (2) follows from (1). Item (3) follows from the simple reason that for every $Z \in [\bigcup_{i<\theta} X_i]^\kappa$ there is $i < \theta$ such that $|Z \cap X_i| = \kappa$ if $\mathrm{cf}\kappa \neq \mathrm{cf}\theta$ and (4) follows from (3).

The inequality (5) follows by the diagonalization argument in the standard proof of the Zermelo-König lemma; in fact, that argument shows that there exists an almost disjoint $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [\mu]^\kappa$ of cardinality $> \mu$, which implies that $\mathcal{D}(\mu,\kappa) > \mu$. □

By (4) and (5) above it follows that $\mathcal{D}(\lambda,\kappa)$ is *not* increasing in κ. For every infinite cardinal ν, $\mathcal{D}(\beth_\omega(\nu),\aleph_0) > \beth_\omega(\nu)$ by (5) while $\mathcal{D}(\beth_\omega(\nu),\aleph_1) = \beth_\omega(\nu)$ by (4) since $\mathcal{D}(\beth_n(\nu),\aleph_1) = \beth_n(\nu)$ for all $n > 1$.

Definition 2.5 (Two-parameters density)**.** *For $\kappa_1 \le \kappa_2 \le \theta$ let $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$ be the least cardinality of a set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\theta]^{\kappa_1}$ with the property that for every $X \in [\theta]^{\kappa_2}$ there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$.*

For a fixed θ and κ_1, $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$ is decreasing in κ_2 and for fixed θ and κ_2 it is increasing in $\kappa_1 \le \kappa_2$. In particular, $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\kappa_1) \ge \mathcal{D}(\theta,\kappa_1,\kappa_2)$ if $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$. This inequality can be strict. For example, $\mathcal{D}(\beth_\omega,\aleph_0) > \beth_\omega = \mathcal{D}(\beth_\omega,\aleph_0,\aleph_1) = \mathcal{D}(\beth_\omega,\aleph_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\beth_{\omega_1},\aleph_0,\aleph_1) = \beth_{\omega_1} < \mathcal{D}(\beth_{\omega_1},\aleph_1)$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let μ be a strong limit cardinal. For every $\lambda \ge \mu$ there is some $\theta(\lambda) < \mu$ such that for every $\theta < \mu$ with $\mathrm{cf}\theta > \theta(\lambda)$ it holds that $\mathcal{D}(\lambda,\theta) = \lambda$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \ge \mu$ be given and let $\theta(\lambda) < \mu$ be fixed by Shelah's Revised GCH theorem such that for every regular $\theta \in (\theta(\lambda),\mu)$ it holds that $\lambda^{[\theta]} = \lambda$.

Assume first that $\theta \in (\theta(\lambda),\mu)$ is regular. Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\theta$ witness $\lambda^{[\theta]} = \lambda$ and, as $2^\theta < \lambda$, assume that $X \in \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow [X]^\theta \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. If $Z \in [\lambda]^\theta$ is arbitrary, fix $\mathcal{Y} \in [\mathcal{D}]^{<\theta}$ such that $Z \subseteq \bigcup \mathcal{Y}$. As θ is regular, there is $X \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $Y := X \cap Z$ has cardinality θ. Since $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ and $Y \subseteq Z$, we have shown that $\mathcal{D}$ is dense in $[\lambda]^\theta$.

Assue now that $\theta \in (\theta(\lambda),\mu)$ is singular and satisfies $\mathrm{cf}\theta > \theta(\lambda)$. Write $\theta = \sum_{i<\mathrm{cf}\theta} \theta_i$ with $\theta_i = \mathrm{cf}\theta_i > \theta(\lambda)$ for each i. Next fix dense $\mathcal{D}_i = \{X^i_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\theta_i}$ and dense $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq [\mathrm{cf}\theta \times \lambda]^{\mathrm{cf}\theta}$ with $|\mathcal{T}'| = \lambda$. The set $\{Y \in \mathcal{T} : i < \mathrm{cf}\theta \Rightarrow |Y \cap (\{i\} \times \lambda)| \le 1\}$, namely, all members of $\mathcal{T}$ which are partial functions from $\mathrm{cf}\theta$ to λ with domain cofinal in $\mathrm{cf}\theta$, has cardinality λ and for every $f : \mathrm{cf}\theta \to \lambda$ there exists $Y \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $Y \subseteq f$.

Let

$$\mathcal{D} = \big\{\bigcup\{X^i_\alpha : \langle i,\alpha\rangle \in Y\} : Y \in T\big\}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\lambda]^\theta$ and $|\mathcal{D}| = \lambda$.

Given any $Z \in [\lambda]^\theta$, define $f(i) = \min\{\alpha < \lambda : X^i_\alpha \subseteq Z\}$ for $i < \mathrm{cf}\theta$. Now $\bigcup_{i<\mathrm{cf}\theta} X^i_{f(i)} \in [Z]^\theta$. There is some $Y \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $Y \subseteq f$. The set $\bigcup\{X^i_\alpha : \langle i,\alpha\rangle \in Y\}$ therefore belongs to $[Z]^\theta \cap \mathcal{D}$. □

Now formula (5) follows.

Corollary 2.7. *For every infinite cardinal ν and $\rho \ge \beth_\omega(\nu)$, for all but finitely many $n < \omega$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{D}(\rho,\beth_n(\nu)) = \rho. \tag{6}$$

I thank S. Shelah for pointing out to me the next lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose μ is an strong limit cardinal. Let χ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $\delta < \chi$ is a limit ordinal. Suppose a sequence $\langle M_i : i \le \delta\rangle$ of elementary submodels of $(H(\chi),\in,\dots)$ satisfies:*

1. *$M_i \subseteq M_{i+1}$ and $M_j = \bigcup_{i<j} M_i$ when $j \le \delta$ is limit;*

(2) *$\langle M_j : j \le i\rangle \in M_{i+1}$ for all $i < \delta$;*
(3) *$\mu \subseteq M_0$ and $|M_i| \subseteq M_i$ for all $i \le \delta$.*

Then there exists $\kappa(*) < \mu$ such that $M_\delta \cap [M_\delta]^\kappa$ is dense in $[M_\delta]^\kappa$ for all κ such that $\kappa(*) \le \mathrm{cf}\kappa \le \kappa < \mu$.

Proof. Denote $\lambda = |M_\delta|$ and for $i < \delta$ denote $\lambda_i = |M_i|$. Let $\kappa(*) < \mu$ be such that $\mathcal{D}(\lambda, \kappa) = \lambda$ for all $\kappa < \mu$ with $\mathrm{cf}\kappa \ge \kappa(*)$. By increasing $\kappa(*)$ if necessary, we assume that $\mathrm{cf}\delta \notin [\kappa(*), \mu)$. Given $i < \delta$ and κ such that $\kappa(*) \le \mathrm{cf}\kappa \le \kappa < \mu$, there exists a dense $\mathcal{D}^\kappa_i \subseteq [M_i]^\kappa$ in M_{i+1} of size $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_i, \kappa)$ by elementarity. As $\lambda_i \le \lambda$, it holds by 2.4(2) that $|\mathcal{D}^\kappa_i| \le \lambda$ for all $i < \delta$. Since $\mathcal{D}^\kappa_i \in M_\delta$ and $|\mathcal{D}^\kappa_i| \le \lambda \subseteq M_\delta$, it follows that $\mathcal{D}^\kappa_i \subseteq M_\delta$. Now $\mathcal{D}^\kappa := \bigcup_{i<\delta} \mathcal{D}^\kappa_i \subseteq M_\delta$ for all $\kappa < \mu$ with $\mathrm{cf}\kappa \ge \kappa(*)$ and has cardinality λ. As $\mathrm{cf}\delta \ne \mathrm{cf}\kappa$ for such κ, the set $\mathcal{D}^\kappa \subseteq M_\delta$ is dense in $[M_\delta]^\kappa$. □

3. Filtrations with respect to anti-monotone set functions

Every infinite subset of a structure with countably many finite-place operations is contained in a subset of the same cardinality which is closed under all operations by the downward Skolem-Löwenheim theorem. Also, the union of any increasing chain of closed sets is closed.

If infinitary operations are admitted, both facts are no longer true and counter-examples for an infinitary Skolem-Löwenheim are easily found.

The main theorem of this sections asserts that for anti-monotone set-functions a version of the Skolem-Löwenheim theorem and filtrations to closed sets exist without appealing to additional axioms.

Definition 3.1. (1) *A* filtration *of an infinite set V is a sequence of sets $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ for some cardinal κ which satisfies:*
  (a) $|D_\alpha| < |V|$.
  (b) $\alpha < \beta < \kappa \Rightarrow D_\alpha \subseteq D_\beta$
  (c) *If $\alpha < \kappa$ is limit then $D_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} D_\beta$.*
  (d) $V = \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} D_\kappa$.
  Condition (c) in the definition is the continuity *of $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle$.*
(2) *Suppose V is an infinite set and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$. A $\mathcal{C}$-filtration of V is a filtration $\langle D_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that $D_\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$.*
(3) *We say that V is $\mathcal{C}$-*filtrable*, for $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$, if there exists a $\mathcal{C}$-filtration of V.*

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$, $I \ne \emptyset$ is countable and $\rho < |V|$ a cardinal. Suppose $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ for $i \in I$ and:*

(1) *For every $i \in I$, the union of every chain of sets from S_i belongs to $\mathcal{C}$.*
(2) *For every $\rho \le \theta < |V|$ there exists $i \in I$ such that for every set $A \in [V]^\theta$ there is $D \in \mathcal{S}_i$ such that $A \subseteq D \in [V]^\theta$.*

Then V is $\mathcal{C}$-filtrable.

Proof. Let $\lambda := |V|$.

Assume first that $\mathrm{cf}\lambda > \aleph_0$. Fix an increasing and continuous chain of sets $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda\rangle$ such that $V = \bigcup_{\alpha<\mathrm{cf}\lambda} A_\alpha$ and $|A_\alpha| < \lambda$ for each $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ and $|A_0| \geq \rho$. Denote $\theta_\alpha := |A_\alpha| < \lambda$.

As $\mathrm{cf}\lambda > \aleph_0$ is regular and I is countable, we may assume, by passing to a subsequence, that for some fixed $i \in I$ it holds that for every $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ and every $B \in [V]^{\theta_{\alpha+1}}$ there is $D \in \mathcal{S}_i$ such that $B \subseteq D$ and $|D| = |B|$.

Define inductively D_α for $0 < \alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$. For limit $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ let $D_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} D_\beta$. For $\alpha = \beta + 1$ choose $D_\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_i$ which contains $A_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} D_\beta$.

$V = \bigcup_{\alpha<\mathrm{cf}\lambda}$ since $A_\alpha \subseteq D_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$, and as $D_{\alpha+1} \in \mathcal{S}_i$, each $D_{\alpha+1}$ belongs to $\mathcal{C}$. By (1) $D_\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$ for limit $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ as well. Thus $\langle D_\alpha : 0 < \alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda\rangle$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-filtration.

If $\mathrm{cf}\lambda = \aleph_0$ fix an increasing union $\lambda = \bigcup_{n<\omega} A_n$ with $|A_n| < \lambda$ and $|A_0| \geq \rho$ and let $D_{n+1} = K(A_{n+1} \cup D_n)$. By (2), $|D_{n+1}| = |A_{n+1}|$ hence $\langle D_{n+1} : n < \omega\rangle$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-filtration. □

Definition 3.3. *Let V be a nonempty set.*

(1) *A* notion of closure *over V is a family of sets $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ that satisfies:*
  (a) $\emptyset, V \in \mathcal{C}$.
  (b) $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow D_1 \cup D_2 \in \mathcal{C}$
  (c) $\bigcap X \in \mathcal{C}$ *for all* $X \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

(2) *A function $K : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is a* closure operator *if it satisfies Kuratowski's closure axioms:*
  (a) $K(\emptyset) = \emptyset$;
  (b) $A \subseteq K(A)$ *for* $A \subseteq V$;
  (c) $K(K(A)) = K(A)$ *for* $A \subseteq V$;
  (d) $K(A \cup B) = K(A) \cup K(B)$ *for* $A, B \subseteq V$.

(3) *A* notion of semi-closure *over V is a family $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ which satisfies $V \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\bigcap X \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $X \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.*

(4) *A function $K : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is a* semi-closure operator *if it satisfies Kuratowski's axioms (b) and (c) and the following implication of (d):*
  (d') $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq X \Rightarrow K(A_1) \subseteq K(A_2)$,

(5) *Given a notion of semi-closure $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ let $K_{\mathcal{C}}(A) = \bigcap\{D : A \subseteq D \in \mathcal{C}$. Conversely, given a semi-closure operator $K : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ let $\mathcal{C}_K = \{D : D = K(D) \subseteq V\}$.*

For every semi-closure operator K on a set V it holds that $K = K_{\mathcal{C}_K}$ and for every notion of semi-closure $\mathcal{C}$ it holds that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{K_{\mathcal{C}}}$. If K is a closure operator then $\mathcal{C}_k$ is a notion of closure and if $\mathcal{C}$ is a notion of closure then $K_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a closure operator. Thus, notions of [semi]-closure and [semi]-closure operators are interchangeable.

Definition 3.4. *Suppose that $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ and κ is a cardinal. Denote by F_κ the restriction $F \restriction [X]^\kappa$ to sets of size κ. The subsets which are closed under F_κ form the following notion of semi-closure $\mathcal{C}_{F,\kappa} = \{D : D \subseteq$*

*$V \wedge (Y \in [D]^\kappa \Rightarrow F(Y) \subseteq D)\}$. Let $K_{F,\kappa}$ denote the semi-closure operator corresponding to $\mathcal{C}_{F,\kappa}$ and let us refer to sets $D \in \mathcal{C}_{F,\kappa}$ as F_κ-*closed *sets.*

Definition 3.5. *A function $F : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)$ is* anti-monotone *if $A \subseteq B \subseteq X \Rightarrow F(B) \subseteq F(A)$.*

Claim 3.6. *Suppose $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is anti-monotone and κ is an infinite cardinal. Then:*

1. *$K_{F,\kappa}$ is a closure operator.*
2. *An increasing union $\bigcup_{\alpha<\theta} D_\alpha$ of $K_{F,\kappa}$-closed sets is $K_{F,\kappa}$-closed if* $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \mathrm{cf}\kappa$

Proof. We verify axiom (4). If $X \in [A \cup B]^\kappa$ then, since κ is infinite, $|X \cap A| = \kappa$ or $|X \cap B| = \kappa$, so by anti-monotonicity $F(X) \subseteq K(A)$ or $F(X) \subseteq K(B)$.

Assume now that $D = \bigcup_{\alpha<\theta} D_i$ is an increasing union of $K_{F,\kappa}$-closed sets and $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \mathrm{cf}\kappa$. Let $X \in [D]^\kappa$. There exists some $\alpha < \theta$ such that $X \cap D_\alpha \in [D_\alpha]^\kappa$. Since D_α is $K_{F,\kappa}$-closed, $F(X \cap D_\alpha) \subseteq D_\alpha$ and by anti-monotonicity $F(X) \subseteq F(X \cap D_\alpha)$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose V is a set and $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is anti-monotone. Suppose $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 < \rho$ are cardinals and $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ for all $X \in [V]^{\kappa_1}$. Let $K = K_{F,\kappa_2}$. If $\theta \geq \rho$ satisfies $\mathcal{D}(\theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2) = \theta$ then $|K(A)| = \theta$ for all $A \in [V]^\theta$.*

Proof. Given $A \in [V]^\theta$ put $A_0 = A$ and for $\zeta \leq \kappa_2^+$ define $A_\zeta \in [V]^\theta$ inductively. For limit $\zeta \leq \kappa_2^+$ let $A_\zeta = \bigcup_{\xi<\zeta} A_\xi$, which is of cardinality θ. To define $A_{\zeta+1}$ for $\zeta < \kappa_2^+$ fix, by the assumption $\mathcal{D}(\theta, \kappa_1, \kappa_2) = \theta$, a set $\mathcal{D}_\zeta \subseteq [A_\zeta]^{\kappa_1}$ of cardinality θ with the property that for all $Y \in [A_\zeta]^{\kappa_2}$ there exists $X \in \mathcal{D}_\zeta$ such that $X \subseteq Y$ and let $A_{\zeta+1} = A_\zeta \cup \bigcup\{F(X) : X \in \mathcal{D}_\zeta\}$, which is of cardinality θ since $\rho \leq \theta$.

For every $X \in [A_{\kappa_2^+}]^{\kappa_2}$ there is some $\zeta < \kappa_2^+$ such that $Y \in [A_\zeta]^{\kappa_2}$ and hence there is some $X \in \mathcal{D}_\zeta$ such that $X \subseteq Y$. As $F(Y) \subseteq F(X) \subseteq A_{\zeta+1}$, it holds that $F(Y) \subseteq A_{\kappa_2^+}$, so $A_{\kappa_2^+}$ is K-closed. □

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose μ is a limit cardinal and $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is anti-monotone. If $\rho \geq \mu$ and every $V' \subseteq V$ of size ρ^+ is F_μ-filtrable, then there is some $\nu < \mu$ such that $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ for all $X \in [V]^\nu$.*

Proof. Assume that $|V| > \rho^+$ and that every $V' \in [V]^{\rho^+}$ is F_μ-filtrable. Fixe $\langle X_i : i < \mu\rangle$ such that $|X|_i < \mu$ and $\lim |X_i| = \mu$ and $|F(X_i)| \geq \rho^+$ and let $V' \subseteq V$ be such that $\bigcup_{i<\mu} X_i \subseteq V'$ and $|F(X_I) \cap V'| = \rho^+ = |V'|$. If $\bigcup_{\xi<\rho^+}$ is a filtration of V' there is some $\xi < \rho^+$ such that $\bigcup_{i<\mu} X_i \subseteq D_\xi$. □

Theorem 3.9 (Asymptotic filtrations for anti-monotone set functions)**.** *Let ν be an infinite cardinal and denote $\mu := \beth_\omega(\nu)$. Let V be a set of cardinality $|V| > \mu$ and suppose $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is an anti-monotone function. If there exists a cardinal $\rho \geq \mu$ such that $\rho < |V|$ and $|F(Y)| \leq \rho$ for every $Y \in [X]^\nu$ then V is $K_{F,\mu}$-filtrable.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the family of all $K_{F,\mu}$-closed subsets of V. Let κ_n denote $\beth_n(\nu)$ and let $K_n = K_{F,\kappa_n}$. Let $\mathcal{S}_n$ be the collection of all K_n-closed subsets of V. We check that conditions (1) and (2) in Theorem 3.2 are satisfied for $\mathcal{C}$ and $\{\mathcal{S}_n : n < \omega\}$.

As $\kappa_n < \mu$ and F is anti-monotone, it holds that $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ for all n. The union of any chain of sets from $\mathcal{S}_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ by Lemma 3.6 (2).

To verify condition (2) let $\theta \geq \rho$ be given. By Lemma 2.6, there exists $m(\theta) < \omega$ such that $D(\theta, \kappa_n) = \theta$ for all $n \geq m(\theta)$. By Lemma 3.7, $|K_n(A)| = \theta$ for $A \in [V]^\theta$ for all $n \geq m(\theta)$.

Now V is $K_{F,\nu}$-filtrable by Theorem 3.2. $\square$

Corollary 3.10. *If $|V| = \lambda = \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ in the previous theorem, then for every enumeration $V = \{v_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ the set of $\alpha < \lambda$ for which $\{v_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ is F_μ-closed is a club of λ.*

We remark that each $\mathcal{S}_n$ is in fact the collection of closed sets with respect to a closure operator and that $m < n \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_m \subseteq \mathcal{S}_n$. Neither of these two properties was required in Theorem 3.2.

The following lemma relates filtrations to elementary chains of models:

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose F is anti-monotone, $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ for all $X \in [V]^\nu$ and $\rho \geq \mu = \beth_\omega(\nu)$. Then for every chain $\langle M_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ of elementary submodels of a sufficiently large $(H(\chi), \in)$ which satisfies $\mu \subseteq M_0$, $|M_i| \subseteq M_i|$, $V, F \in M_0$ and $\langle M_j : j \leq i \rangle \in M_{i+1}$ the set $D_i := M_i \cap V$ is F_μ closed for every limit $i < \lambda$. If $|M_i| < \lambda := |V|$ then $\langle D_i : i < \lambda \text{ is limit} \rangle$ is a μ-filtration of V.*

Proof. If $M \prec (H(\chi), \in, \dots)$ and $V, F \in M$, $\rho \subseteq M$, then for every $X \in M \cap [V]^\kappa$ for $\nu \leq \kappa < \nu$ the set $F(X)$ belongs to M and $|F(X)| \leq \rho$, hence $F(X) \subseteq M$. Thus, if $M \cap [V]^\kappa$ is dense in $[V]^\kappa$, the set $V \cap M$ is κ-closed. By 2.8 this is the case for M_i for all limit $i < \lambda$.

If indeed $|M_i| < \lambda$ for all i the $|D_i| < \lambda$. The fact that $\bigcup_{i<\lambda} D_i = V$ follows from $V \in M_0$ and $\lambda \subseteq \bigcup_{i<\lambda} M_i$. $\square$

3.1. **Assuming mild restrictions on cardinal arithmetic.**

Tighter filtration theorems follow easily from mild restrictions on cardinal arithmetic. Erdős and Hajnal used the GCH and a theorem of Tarski [24] in [2, 3] to get filtrations. In [10] filtrations were obtained from a much weaker cardinal arithmetic assumption than the GCH: For some κ it holds that $\kappa^\nu = \kappa$ and every $\mu > \kappa$ with cofinality μ^+ is closed under the function $x \mapsto x^\mu$. See Definition 2.3 and Theorem 2.4 in [10] there for more details. The consistency of the negation of this assumption requires the consistency large cardinal axioms.

A relaxation of this cardinal arithmetic assumption is used in the Lemma 3.13 below.

Claim 3.12. *Suppose $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}\kappa > \nu \geq \aleph_0$, $\mathcal{D}(\kappa,\nu) = \kappa$ and for every singular $\theta > 2^\nu$ of cofinality κ the cardinals $\delta < \theta$ which satisfy $\mathcal{D}(\delta,\nu) = \delta$ are unbounded in θ. Then $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\nu,\kappa) = \theta$ for every $\theta \geq 2^\nu$.*

Proof. By induction on $\theta \geq \kappa$. For $\theta = \kappa$ the equality $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\nu,\kappa)$ is assumed, so assume $\theta > \kappa$.

Case 1. $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \kappa$. For every $\kappa \leq \alpha < \theta$ fix, by the induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^\nu$ of cardinality $|\alpha|$ such that for every $X \in [\alpha]^{\nu^+}$ there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ such that $Y \subseteq X$. Let $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{\kappa\leq\alpha<\theta} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$. Clearly, $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [\theta]^\nu$ and $|\mathcal{D}| = \theta$. Since $\mathrm{cf}\theta \neq \kappa$, for every $Y \in [\theta]^\kappa$ there exist unboundedly many $\alpha < \theta$ such that $|Y \cap A| = \kappa$. Let $\alpha \geq \kappa$ be such an α and by the choice of $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ there exists some $Y \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$.

Case 2: $\mathrm{cf}\theta = \kappa$. By the assumption, fix $\langle \theta_i : i < \nu^+ \rangle$, an increasing sequence of cardinals with limit θ such that $\mathcal{D}(\theta_i,\nu) = \theta_i$ and let $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i<\kappa} \mathcal{D}_i$ where $\mathcal{D}_i \subseteq [\theta_i]^\nu$ is of cardinality θ_i and dense in $[\theta_i]^\nu$. Given $X \in [\theta]^\kappa$ there exists some $i < \kappa$ such that $|X \cap \theta_i| \geq \nu$ and hence there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that $Y \subseteq X$. □

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ is anti-monotone, $\nu < \kappa = \mathrm{cf}\kappa < \rho < |V|$ and that $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ for all $X \in [V]^\nu$. Assume:*

(*) *$\mathcal{D}(\kappa,\nu,\kappa) = \kappa$ and for every cardinal $\theta > \kappa$ of cofinality κ the set of $\delta < \theta$ which satisfy $\mathcal{D}(\delta,\nu) = \delta$ is unbounded in θ.*

Then V is F_{κ^+}-filtrable.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ be the collection of all F_{κ^+}-closed sets and let $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be the collections of all F_κ-closed sets. By Claim 3.12, for every $\theta \geq \kappa$ it holds that $\mathcal{D}(\theta,\nu,\kappa) = \theta$, so by Lemma 3.7, every $\theta \geq \rho$ is contained in an F_κ-closed set of the same cardinality. $\mathcal{C}$-filtrability follows now from 3.2. □

For every ν it holds that $\mathcal{D}(2^\nu,\nu) = 2^\nu$ and $\mathcal{D}((2^\nu)^+,\nu) = (2^\nu)^+$.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $\nu = \mathrm{cf}\nu$ be infinite and denote $\kappa = (2^\nu)^+$. If condition $(*)$ holds for κ then Lemma 3.13 follows.*

Thus, for the filtration theorem in the $(2^\nu)^+$ version not to hold for sufficiently large ν a model of set theory in which there is no bound on the size of jumps between a strong limit cardinals and their power. Such models can be constructed with Prikry-Silver type methods from a proper class of suitable large cardinals. See for example [7].

3.2. **The need for $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$.**

Is the restriction $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$ optimal in Theorem 3.9? This is not known at the moment. But something can be said about it: improving it will be at least as hard as proving one of the following versions of Shelah's Weak Hypothesis, indexed by $n > 0$:

(SWH$_n$) There are no infinite ν and ρ such that $\beth_n(\nu) < \rho < \beth_\omega(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \rho^+\} \subseteq [\rho]^\rho$ satisfies $|A_\alpha \cap A_\beta| < \nu$ for $\alpha < \beta < \rho^+$.

Shelah's Weak Hypothesis is a dynamic statement whose evolving contents is the weakest unproved pcf-theoretic statement. It is formulated in terms of patterns in Shelah's function pp. See [21] for the translation of SWH from pcf to almost disjoint families. The negations of first two versions of the SWH have been shown consistent. Gitik [7] showed the consistency of an ω sequence of cardinals with pp of each exceeding the limit of the sequence. SWH was then revised to the statement that there was no such ω_1 sequence. Recently, Gitik [6] proved the consistency of the existence of an ω_1 sequence of cardinals with the pp of each exceeding the limit of the sequence.

Shelah's believes that the negations of the versions above will eventually be proved consistent.

Suppose that $\beth_n(\nu) < \rho < \beth_\omega(\nu)$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \rho^+\} \subseteq [\rho]^\rho$ satisfies $|A_\alpha \cap A_\beta| < \nu$ for $\alpha < \beta < \rho^+$. Let $V = \rho \dot\cup \mathcal{F}$ and let $F(X) = \{\alpha : X \cap \rho \subseteq A_\alpha\} \cup \bigcap_{A \in X \cap \mathcal{F}} A$. This is an anti-monotone function and for every X with $|X| \geq \nu^+$ it holds that $|F(X)| < \nu$. Yet, there is no filtration of V to F_ν-closed sets, as ρ would have to be contained in one of the parts, and every F_ν-closed set which contains ρ is equal to V.

Thus, improving in ZFC $\beth_\omega(\nu)$ in Theorem 3.9 to some $\beth_n(\nu)$ would imply the n-th version of the Shelah Weak Hypothesis. If the negations of (SWH_n) are consistent for all $n > 0$, then $\beth_\omega$ is indeed optimal.

4. Splitting families of sets

Following [2] let us say that a family $\mathcal{F}$ of sets satisfies condition $C(\lambda, \kappa)$ if the intersection of every subfamily of $\mathcal{F}$ of size λ is of size strictly less than ν. Miller [18] define *property B* of a family of sets $\mathcal{F}$ as: there exists a set B such that $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$ and $A \not\subseteq B$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and proved that for every infinite ρ, every ρ-uniform family of sets that satisfies $C(\rho^+, n)$ for some natural number n satisfies property B. Erdős and Hajnal [2] used Miller's method to prove from the assumption GCH that every ρ-uniform family that satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ for an infinite cardinal ν satisfies property B if $\rho > \nu^+$.

More results with the GCH followed along this line [14, 15, 10, 11]. Komjáth [14] proved from the GCH that for $\nu^+ < \rho$ every ρ-uniform $\mathcal{F}$ which satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ and is also almost disjoint is *essentially disjoint*, that is, it can be made pairwise disjoint by removing a set of size $< \rho$ from each member of $\mathcal{F}$.

Komjáth [15] investigated further the property of essential disjointness which he introduced in [14] (under the name "sparseness") and proved that the array of cardinalities of pairwise intersections in an $\aleph_0$-uniform a.d family determines whether the family is essentially disjoint or not.

In [10] the authors proved a general theorem which implied many of the Miller-type theorems known at the time and derived also new combinatorial and topological consequences with it by assuming as an additional axiom a relaxation of the GCH to a weak version of the Singular Cardinal Hypothesis.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of sets.*

1. *The* universe of $\mathcal{F}$ *is the set* $\bigcup F$*, and is denoted by* $V(\mathcal{F})$*.*
2. *Given* $U \subseteq V(\mathcal{F})$ *let* $\mathcal{F}(U) = \{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{P}(U)\} = \{A : A \in \mathcal{F} \wedge A \subseteq U\}$*.*
3. $\mathcal{F}$ *is* ρ*-uniform, for a cardinal* ρ*, if* $|A| = \rho$ *for all* $A \in \mathcal{F}$*.*

Definition 4.2. *Suppose that* $\mathcal{F}$ *is a family of sets and* $V = V(\mathcal{F})$*.*

1. *A set* $U \subseteq V$ *is* κ*-closed, for a cardinal* κ*, if* $|A \cap U| \geq \kappa \Rightarrow A \subseteq U$ *for all* $A \in \mathcal{F}$*.*
2. *Let* $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ *be defined by*
$$F(X) = \bigcup\{A : X \subseteq A \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

Claim 4.3. *For every family* $\mathcal{F}$ *with* $V = V(\mathcal{F})$ *and cardinal* κ*,*

1. *The collection* $\mathcal{C}_\kappa$ *of all* κ*-closed sets is a notion of semi-closure over* V *and if* κ *is infinite then* $\mathcal{D}_\kappa$ *is a notion of closure.*
2. *If* $U \subseteq V$ *is* κ*-closed and* $A \in \mathcal{F}$ *is not contained in* U *then* $|A \cap U| < \kappa$*.*
3. *The function* F *defined above is anti-monotone.*
4. *For every* $U \subseteq V$*,* U *is* κ*-closed iff* U *is* $K_{F,\kappa}$*-closed.*
5. *If* $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$ *are cardinals then* $\mathcal{C}_{\kappa_1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\kappa_2}$*.*
6. *If* $\mathcal{F}$ *is* ρ*-uniform and* $\kappa \leq \rho$ *then a set* $U \subseteq V$ *is* κ*-closed iff* $\mathcal{F}(U) = \{A : A \in \mathcal{F} \wedge |A \cap U| \geq \kappa\}$*.*
7. *Abusing notation, we say that a subfamily* $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ *is* κ*-closed if* $V(\mathcal{F}')$ *is* κ*-closed and we denote by* $K_{F,\kappa}(\mathcal{F})$ *the family* $\mathcal{F}(K_{F,\kappa}(V(\mathcal{F})))$*.*

Definition 4.4 (Disjointness conditions)**.**

1. $\mathcal{F}$ *is* almost disjoint *(a.d.) if* $|A \cap B| < \min\{|A|, |B|\}$ *for distinct* $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$*.*
2. $\mathcal{F}$ *is* ν*-disjoint, for a cardinal* ν*, if* $|A \cap B| < \nu$ *for any two distinct* $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$*.*
3. *(Miller* [18]*, Erdős and Hajnal* [2]*)* $\mathcal{F}$ *satisfies condition* $C(\theta, \nu)$ *for cardinals* θ, ν *if* $|\bigcap \mathcal{A}| < \nu$ *for all* $\mathcal{A} \in [\mathcal{F}]^\theta$ *(so,* $C(2, \nu)$ *is* ν*-disjointness).*
4. *(Komjáth* [14]*, Hajnal, Juhász and Shelah* [10]*)* $\mathcal{F}$ *is* essentially disjoint *(e.d) if there exists an assignment of subsets* $B(A) \in [A]^{<|A|}$ *for all* $A \in \mathcal{A}$ *such that the family* $\{A \setminus B(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ *is pairwise disjoint.*
5. $\mathcal{F}$ *is* ν*-e.d if for every* $A \in \mathcal{F}$ *there exists an assignment* $B(A) \in [A]^\nu$ *such that* $\{A \setminus B(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ *is pairwise disjoint. Remark: in* [] *the name* sparse *is used instead of e.d.*

Claim 4.5.

1. *Suppose* $\mathcal{F}$ *is* ρ*-uniform and satisfies* $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ *for some* $\nu < \rho$*. If* $\nu \leq \kappa \leq \rho \leq \theta$ *and* $D(\theta, \kappa) = \theta$ *then for every* $U \in [V]^\theta$ *it holds that* $|\{A \in \mathcal{F} : |A \cap U| \geq \kappa\}| \leq \theta$*.*
2. *Suppose* ν *is an infinite cardinal,* $\mu = \beth_\omega(\nu)$*,* $\rho \geq \mu$ *and* $\mathcal{F}$ *is a* ρ*-uniform family with univers* V*. If* $\mathcal{F}$ *satisfies* $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ *then for every* $\theta \geq \rho$ *and* $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$*,* $|\mathcal{F}'| = \theta \iff |V(\mathcal{F}')| = \theta$*.*

Proof. To prove (1) fix a dense $\mathcal{D} \subseteq [U]^\kappa$ of cardinality θ. If $|A \cap U| \geq \kappa$ for some $A \in \mathcal{F}$ then there exists $X \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $X \subseteq A$. By $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ and $\nu \leq \kappa$, each $X \in \mathcal{D}$ is contained in no more than ρ members of $\mathcal{F}$, so $|\{A \in \mathcal{F} : (\exists X \in \mathcal{D})(X \subseteq A)\}| \leq \theta \times \rho = \theta$.

For (2) assume first that $|V(\mathcal{F}')| = \theta \geq \rho$. Let n be such that $\mathcal{D}(\theta, \kappa_n) = \theta$ (where $\kappa_n = \beth_n(\nu)$). Clearly $\mathcal{F}(U) \subseteq \{A \in \mathcal{F} : |A \cap U| \geq \kappa_n\}$ which, by (1), has cardinality $\leq \theta$. The converse implication is trivial. □

By the above lemma, for all sufficiently large n it holds that $|K_n(\mathcal{F}')| = |\mathcal{F}'|$ if $|\mathcal{F}'| \geq \rho$.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose ν is an infinite cardinal, $\mu = \beth_\omega(\nu)$, $\rho \geq \mu$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is a ρ-uniform family with univers V such that $|V| > \rho$. If $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ then V is μ-filtrable.*

Proof. The function F defined above is anti-monotone, for every $X \in [V]^\nu$ it holds that $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ by $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ and $\rho < |V|$. By Theorem 3.9, V is $K_{F,\mu}$-filtrable hence μ-filtrable. □

The next theorem extends Miller's Theorem 2 from [18]. Miller's theorem concludes property B from $C(\rho^+, n)$ for a finite n. The conclusion here is stronger than the existence of disjoint refinement and ν can be either finite or infinite.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose ν is a cardinal and $\rho \geq \mu := \beth_\omega(\nu)$. For every ρ-uniform family $\mathcal{F}$ that satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ there exists an enumeration $\mathcal{F} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < |\mathcal{F}|\}$ and a family of sets $\{d_\alpha : \alpha < |\mathcal{F}|\}$ such that*

- *(i) $d_\alpha \in [A_\alpha]^\rho$ for every $\alpha < |\mathcal{F}|$ and $\beta < \alpha < |\mathcal{F}| \Rightarrow d_\beta \cap d_\alpha = \emptyset$;*
- *(ii) $|\{\beta < \alpha : A_\beta \cap d_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}| < \rho$ for all $\alpha < |\mathcal{F}|$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = |\mathcal{F}|$ and we prove the theorem by induction on λ. If $|\mathcal{F}| \leq \rho$ fix any enumeration $\mathcal{F} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$. Every ρ-uniform family of cardinality at most ρ has a disjoint refinement, so we can fix $d_\alpha \in [A_\alpha]^\rho$ so that $\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow d_\beta \cap d_\alpha = \emptyset$. This settles (*i*). Conclusion (*ii*) holds trivially as $\lambda \leq \rho$.

Assume that $\lambda > \rho$. Since $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$ it is μ-filtrable by 4.6. For finite ν, filtrability is proved in Miller's [18] and does not require 4.6.

Fix a strictly increasing and continuous union $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup\{\mathcal{H}_i : i < \mathrm{cf}\lambda\}$ of μ-closed families $\mathcal{H}_i$, with $|\mathcal{H}_0| \geq \rho$ and $|\mathcal{H}_i| < \lambda$.

Put $\mathcal{F}'_i = \mathcal{H}_i \setminus \bigcup_{j<i} \mathcal{H}_j$ for $i < \mathrm{cf}\rho$ and let $\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}'_j$ for the least $j \geq i$ such that $\mathcal{F}'_j$ is not empty.

Now $\{\mathcal{F}_i : i < \mathrm{cf}\rho\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{F}$, $|\mathcal{F}_i| < \lambda$ for each i and $A \in \mathcal{F}_i$ implies that

$$|A \cap \bigcup_{j<i} \mathcal{F}_j| < \mu. \tag{7}$$

Denote $\lambda_i = |\mathcal{F}_i|$. As $\lambda_i < \lambda$ for every $i < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ and $\mathcal{F}_i$ satisfies $C(\rho^+, \nu)$, the induction hypothesis allows us to fix for each i an enumeration $\mathcal{F}_i =$

$\{A_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$ and $\{d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} : \gamma < \lambda_i\}$ such that $d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \in [A_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle}]^\rho$ for each $\gamma < \lambda_i$, $d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \cap d'_{\langle i,\delta\rangle} = \emptyset$ for all $\gamma < \delta < \lambda_i$ it holds that and for each $\gamma < \lambda_i$:

$$|\{\delta < \gamma : A_{\langle i,\delta\rangle} \cap d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \neq \emptyset\}| < \rho. \tag{8}$$

For $i < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ and $\gamma < \lambda_i$ define

$$d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} := d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \setminus \bigcup_{j<i} V(\mathcal{F}_j). \tag{9}$$

By (19) and $d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \subseteq A_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle}$ it holds that $|d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle}| = \rho$.

Let $I = \{\langle i,\gamma\rangle : i < \mathrm{cf}\lambda \wedge \gamma < \lambda_i\}$ be well-orderede by the lexicographic ordering $<_{lx}$ of pairs of ordinals. As $|I| = \lambda$ and each proper initial segment of I has cardinality $< \lambda$, it holds that $\langle I, <_{lx}\rangle$ is order-isomorphic to λ.

Identifying λ with $\langle I, <_{lx}\rangle$ we now have an enumeration $\mathcal{F} = \{A_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} : \langle i,\gamma\rangle \in I\}$. The sets $d_{\langle i,g\rangle} \in [A_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle}]^\rho$ have been defined in (9) for each $\langle i,\gamma\rangle \in I$ and satisfy $d_{\langle \delta,j\rangle} \cap d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} = \emptyset$ for $\langle j,\delta\rangle \neq \langle i,\gamma\rangle$ in I. This shows that the enumeration of $\mathcal{F}$ and the family $\{d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} : \langle i,\gamma\rangle \in I\}$ satisfy conclusion (i) of the theorem.

To show that (ii) also holds, let $\langle i,\gamma\rangle \in I$ be arbitrary and let

$$X = \{\langle j,\delta\rangle <_{lx} \langle i,\gamma\rangle : A_{\langle j,\delta\rangle} \cap d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \neq \emptyset\}. \tag{10}$$

If $j < i$ then $\langle j,\delta\rangle \notin X$ as $A_{\langle j,\delta\rangle} \cap d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} = \emptyset$ by (9), hence

$$X = \{\langle i,\delta\rangle <_{lx} \langle i,\gamma\rangle : A_{\langle i,\delta\rangle} \cap d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \neq 0\}. \tag{11}$$

As $d_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle} \subseteq d'_{\langle i,\gamma\rangle}$, it follows from (8) that $|X| < \rho$. □

Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 4.6 have more implications. In the next corollary (1) extends to infinite ν the case of ρ-uniform $\mathcal{F}$ in Theorem 3 of [14] and eliminates the GCH from a stronger form of a Theorem 6 in [2]; (3) eliminates the additional axiom $A(\nu,\rho)$ from Theorem 2.4 in [10] for sufficiently large ρ — in the notation there, $\mathrm{ED}(\nu,\rho)$ for all $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$ in ZFC. (2) is a generalization of (3); (4) eliminates the GCH from Theorem 5 in [14] for sufficiently large ρ.

Corollary 4.8. *If ν is infinite and $\rho \geq \mu := \beth_\omega(\nu)$ then for every ρ-uniform family $\mathcal{F}$:*

1. *If $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $C(\rho^+,\nu)$ then $\mathcal{F}$ has a disjoint refinement.*
2. *If $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $C(\rho^+,\nu)$ and for a cardinal $\mu \leq \theta \leq \rho$ every subfamily of $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality ρ is θ-e.d then $\mathcal{F}$ is θ-e.d.*
3. *If $\mathcal{F}$ is ν-a.d then $\mathcal{F}$ is e.d.*
4. *If ρ is regular and $\mathcal{F}$ is a.d and satisfies $C(\rho^+,\nu)$ then $\mathcal{F}$ is e.d.*

Proof. (1) follows directly from the theorem.

To prove (2) let $|\mathcal{F}| = \lambda > \rho$ and assume, by μ-filtrability, that $\mathcal{F}$ is partitioned to $\{\mathcal{H}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that $|\mathcal{H}_\alpha| < \lambda$ and $|A \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} V(\mathcal{H}_\beta)| < \mu$ for all $A \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$. Fix, by the induction hypothesis, $B_\alpha(A) \in [A]^{<\theta}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$ such that $\{A \setminus B_\alpha(A) : A \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha\}$ is pairwise disjoint. For $A \in \mathcal{F}$ let

$B(A) = B_\alpha(A) \cup (A \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} V(\mathcal{H}_\beta))$ for the unique α such that $A \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$. As $|A \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} V(\mathcal{H}_\beta)| < \mu$ it holds that $|B(A)| < \theta$. Clearly, $\{A \setminus B(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is pairwise disjoint.

For (3): every ν-a.d. ρ-uniform family satisfies $C(2, \nu)$ hence $C(\rho^+, \nu)$. If $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ has cardinality ρ and is well ordered by $\mathcal{F}' = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \rho\}$ let $B(A_\alpha) = A_\alpha \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} A_\beta$. The cardinality of B_α is strictly smaller than ρ and $\{A_\alpha \setminus B_\alpha : \alpha < \rho\}$ is disjoint. Now (3) follows from (2).

For (4), as ρ is regular and $\mathcal{F}$ is a.d, every subfamily of $\mathcal{F}$ of cardinality ρ is e.d and now use (2). $\square$

Neither of the corollaries above required conclusion (*ii*) of Theorem 4.7. A generalization of his condition is used for the next theorem on *list conflict-free numbers.*

Definition 4.9. (1) *A coloring c of $V(\mathcal{F})$ for a family of sets $\mathcal{F}$ is* conflict free *if for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$ there is $x \in A$ such that $c(x) \neq c(y)$ for all $y \in A \setminus \{x\}$.*

(2) *The* conflict free number $\chi_{CF}(\mathcal{F})$ *is the smallest cardinal κ for which there exists a conflict-free coloring $c : V(\mathcal{F}) \to \kappa$.*

(3) *The* list-conflict-free number $\chi_{\ell CF}(\mathcal{F})$ *is the smalles cardinal κ such that for every assignments L of sets $L(v)$ to every $v \in V$ which satisfies $|L(v)| \geq \kappa$ there exists a conflict-free coloring c on V which satisfies $c(v) \in L(v)$ for all $v \in V$.*

Clearly, every ν-e.d family $\mathcal{F}$ has a coloring by ν-colors such that all but $< \nu$ colors in each $A \in \mathcal{F}$ are unique in A.

Claim 4.10. *Let $\rho \geq \theta > 0$ be cardinals and let $\mathcal{F}$ is a nonempty ρ-uniform family. Suppose there exists an enumeration $\mathcal{F} = \{A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ and a family $\{d_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that*

(*i*) *$d_\alpha \in [A_\alpha]^\theta$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\beta < \alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow d_\beta \cap d_\alpha = \emptyset$;*

(*iii*) *$|\{\beta < \alpha : A_\beta \cap d_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}| \leq \rho$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.*

Then

(1) *For every list-assignment $L(v)$ for $v \in V$ with $|L(v)| \geq \rho^+$ there exists a coloring $c \in \prod_{v \in V} L(v)$ such that for every $\alpha < \lambda$ and every $x \in D_\alpha$ the color $c(x)$ is unique in A_α.*

(2) *$\chi_{\ell \mathrm{CF}}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \rho^+$.*

Proof. Assume that $L(v)$ is given with $|L(v)| \geq \rho^+$ for all $v \in V(\mathcal{F})$. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ enumerate $d_\alpha = \langle x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle} : i < \theta \rangle$. Define $c \in \prod_{v \in V} L(v)$ arbitrarily on $V \setminus \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} d_\alpha$. Next define $c(x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle})$ by induction on the lexicographic ordering on $\lambda \times \theta$. Suppose $c(x_{\langle \beta, j \rangle})$ is defined for $\langle \beta, j \rangle <_{lx} \langle \alpha, i \rangle$. Define

$$F(x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle}) = \{c(y) : (\exists \beta \leq \alpha)\, [x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle} \in A_\beta \wedge y \in A_\beta \wedge c(y) \text{ is defined}]\} \tag{12}$$

and choose

$$c(x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle}) \in L(x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle}) \setminus F(x_{\langle \alpha, i \rangle}). \tag{13}$$

By the assumption (3), $|F(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})| \leq \rho$, so as $|L(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})| \geq \rho^+$ the set $L(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle}) \setminus F(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ is not empty and therefore $c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ can be chosen as required in (13).

To prove that the color $c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ is unique in A_α for every $\alpha < \lambda$ and $i < \theta$ suppose that $\alpha < \lambda$ and $i < \theta$ are given and $z \in A_\alpha \setminus \{x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle}\}$. If $c(z)$ is defined at stage $\langle\alpha, i\rangle$ of the inductive definition, then $c(z) \in F(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ by (12) and hence $c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle}) \neq c(z)$ by (13).

Otherwise, there is some $\beta > \alpha$ and $j < \theta$ such that $z = x_{\langle\beta,j\rangle}$. This means that $x_{\langle\beta,j\rangle} \in A_\alpha$. As $c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ is defined at stage $\langle\beta, j\rangle$, it follows by (12) that $c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle}) \in F(x_{\langle\beta,j\rangle})$ and $c(z) = c(x_{\langle\beta,j\rangle)}) \neq c(x_{\langle\alpha,i\rangle})$ by (13). □

By combining Theorem 4.7 with the Claim 4.10 we get:

Corollary 4.11. *For every infinite* ν *and* $\rho \geq \beth_\omega(\nu)$*, every* ρ*-uniform family which satisfies* $C(\nu, \rho^+)$ *satisfies* $\chi_{\ell CF}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \rho^+$*.*

In [11] it was proved that a κ-uniform family which is r-a.d for finite r has countable conflict-free number. See also [16], where the uniformity condition is removed.

4.1. **Comparing almost disjoint families.**

We conclude this section with a generalization of a theorem of Komjáth on comparing families of sets.

Definition 4.12. *Two families of sets* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *are* similar *if there is a bijection* $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ *such that* $|A \cap B| = |f(A) \cap f(B)|$ *for all* $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$*.*

Komjáth [15] addressed the following question: which combinatorial properties of $\aleph_0$-uniform families are invariant under similarity? Property B and the existence of a disjoint refinement are not similarity invariant even for uniform families, as one can replace $A \in \mathcal{F}$ by $A \cup D(A)$ where $D(A) \cap D(B) = \emptyset$ for distinct $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ and obtain an equivalent family which has a disjoint refinement from a family which does not satisfy property B. However, Komjáth proved:

Theorem 4.13 (Komjáth [15])**.** *Suppose* $\mathcal{F}$ *and* $\mathcal{G}$ *are* $\aleph_0$*-uniform, almost disjoint and equivalent. If* $\mathcal{F}$ *is e.d. then also* $\mathcal{G}$ *is e.d. More generally:* G *is e.d if* $\mathcal{F}$ *is and there exists a bijection* $f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{G}$ *such that* $|A \cap B| \geq |f(A) \cap f(B)|$ *for all* $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$*.*

The cardinal $\aleph_0$ is strong limit and regular, that is, strongly inaccessible. As a corollary of the next theorem, Komjáth's theorem extends from $\aleph_0$ to all strongly inaccessible cardinals, but actually more is proved.

Theorem 4.14. *Suppose* μ *is a strong limit cardinal and* $\rho \geq \mu$*. Suppose* $\mathcal{F} = \{A_a : \alpha < \lambda\}, \mathcal{G} = \{B_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ *are* ρ*-uniform and for every* $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ *it holds that*

$$|A_\alpha \cap A_\beta| \geq |B_\alpha \cap B_\beta|. \tag{14}$$

Then if $\mathcal{F}$ *is* $< \mu$*-essentially disjoint, so is* $\mathcal{G}$*, provided that every subfamily of* $\mathcal{G}$ *of cardinality* ρ *is* μ*-e.d.*

Proof. Let $C_\alpha \in [A_\alpha]^{<\mu}$ be fixed for all $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $(A_\alpha \setminus C_\alpha) \cap (A_\beta \setminus C_\beta) = \emptyset$ for all $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$. We prove by induction on $\lambda \geq \rho$ that $\mathcal{G}$ is $< \mu$-e.d. If $\lambda = \rho$ then $\mathcal{G}$ is μ-e.d by the assumption that every subfamily of $\mathcal{G}$ of cardinality ρ is μ-e.d.

For singular $\lambda > \rho$ the conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis by Proposition 5 in [14].

Assume then that $\lambda > \rho$ is regular. We may assume that $V(\mathcal{F}) = V(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \lambda$. As $\mathcal{F}$ is $< \mu$-a.d. it follows that $|V(\mathcal{F})| = \lambda$, so we assume that actually $V(\mathcal{F}) = \lambda$.

Let $\overline{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be an elementary chain of models $M_\alpha \prec (H(\Omega), \in, \prec)$ for a sufficiently large regular Ω such that $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} \in M_0$ and also the function $A_\alpha \mapsto C_\alpha$ belongs to M_0, such that:

(1) $\rho \subseteq M_0$ and $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow M_\alpha \subseteq M_\beta$.
(2) $M_\alpha \cap \lambda \in \lambda$ and $|M_\alpha| \subseteq M_\alpha$.
(3) $\langle M_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle \in M_{\alpha+1}$.

Let $\delta(\alpha) = M_\alpha \cap \lambda$.

For each ordinal $\gamma < \delta(\alpha)$ there is at most one $\beta < \lambda$ such that $\gamma \in A_\beta \setminus C_\beta$. Thus, whenever $\gamma \in A_\beta \setminus C_\beta$ and $\gamma < \delta(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha < \lambda$, by elementarity $A_\beta \in M_\alpha$ and hence $A_\beta \subseteq \delta(\alpha)$. If $\beta \geq \delta(\alpha)$, then, it follows that $A_\beta \cap \delta(\alpha) \subseteq C_\beta$.

For each $\beta < \lambda$ let $\kappa(\beta) = |C_\beta|$. We get:

$$\beta \geq \delta(\alpha) \Rightarrow |A_\beta \cap \delta(\alpha)| \leq \kappa(\beta). \tag{15}$$

and, since $\gamma < \delta(\alpha) \Rightarrow A_\gamma \subseteq \delta(\alpha)$,

$$\beta \geq \delta(\alpha) > \gamma \Rightarrow |A_\beta \cap A_\gamma| \leq \kappa(\beta). \tag{16}$$

By assumption (14), condition (16) can be copied over to $\mathcal{G}$, that is:

$$\beta \geq \delta(\alpha) > \gamma \Rightarrow |B_\beta \cap B_\gamma| \leq \kappa(\beta). \tag{17}$$

Claim 4.15. *There exists a closed unbounded $E \subseteq \{\delta(\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that for every $\delta \in E$ and $\beta \geq \delta$ it holds that*

$$|B_\beta \cap \delta| < \mu. \tag{18}$$

Proof of Claim. Suppose to the contrary that $S \subseteq \{\delta(\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ is stationary and that $\beta(\delta) \geq \delta$ is chosen for $\delta \in S$ such that $|A_{\beta(\delta)} \cap \delta| \geq \mu$. We may assume that $\delta_1 < \delta_2 \Rightarrow \beta(\delta_1) < \delta_2$ for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in S$ by intersecting S with a club, and by thinning S out assume that $\kappa(\beta(\delta)) = |C_{\beta(\delta)}| = \kappa(*)$ is fixed for all $\delta \in S$.

The set $S' = S \cap \mathrm{acc} S$ is stationary. If $\delta \in S'$ then for all sufficiently large regular $\kappa < \mu$ it holds that $M_\delta \cap [\delta]^\kappa$ is dense in $[\delta]^\kappa$ by Lemma 2.8, hence, as $|B_{\beta(\delta)} \cap \delta| \geq \mu$, for each sufficiently large regular $\kappa < \mu$ there is $X \in M_\delta$ such that $|X| = \kappa$ and $X \subseteq B_{\beta(\delta)}$.

Define $F(\delta) = X$, for each $\delta \in S'$, such that $X \subseteq B_{\beta(\delta)}$, $X \in M_\delta$ and $|X| > \kappa(*)$. By Fodor's Lemma, we can assume that F is fixed on a stationary $S'' \subseteq S'$. Fix, then, $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ in S'' with $F(\delta_1) = F(\delta_2) = X \in M_{\delta_1}$. But now $|B_{\beta(\delta_1)} \cap B_{\beta(\delta_2)}| \geq |X| > \kappa(*)$, and as $\beta(\delta_1) < \delta_2$ this contradicts equation (17) above. $\square$

The conclusion of the theorem now follows from the induction hypothesis. $\square$

In the case that $\rho = \mu = \mathrm{cf}\mu$ the assumption that every subfamily of $\mathcal{G}$ of cardinality ρ is μ-e.d is, of course, superfluous, as $\mathcal{G}$ is a.d by the similarity with $\mathcal{F}$ and every ρ-uniform a.d family of regular size ρ is e.d.

I do not know if the aforementioned assumption in Theorem 4.14 is necessary, but at least it is not vacuous:

Claim 4.16. *For every set of cardinals C of limit order-type ζ with $\sup C = \mu$, for every cardinal $\rho \geq \mu$ with $\mathrm{cf}\rho > |\zeta|$ that satisfies $\rho \not\to [\rho]^2_{|\zeta|}$ there is a μ-a.d ρ-uniform family of size ρ which is not μ-e.d.*

Proof. Generally, for every infinite cardinal ρ and every assignment of cardinals $\nu_{\{\alpha,\beta\}} \leq \rho$ to for all $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in [\rho]^2$ there is a ρ-uniform family $\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \rho\}$ such that $|A_\alpha \cap A_\beta| = \nu_{\{\alpha,\beta\}}$ for $\{a, \beta\} \in [\rho]^2$: let $\{A_{\{\alpha,\beta\}} : \{\alpha, \beta\} \in [\rho]^2\} \cup \{B_\alpha : \alpha < \rho\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint sets with $|A_{\{\alpha,\beta\}}| = \nu_{\{\alpha,\beta\}}$ and $|B_\alpha| = \rho$ and put $A_\alpha = B_\alpha \cup \bigcup\{A_{\{\alpha,\beta\}} : \beta \in \rho \setminus \{\alpha\}\}$.

Fix a function $f : [\rho]^2 \to C$ so that $\mathrm{ran}(f \restriction W) = C$ for all $W \in [rho]^\rho$ and find a ρ-uniform $\mathcal{F} = \{A_i : i < \rho\}$ such that $|A_i \cap A_j| = f(i, j)$ for $i < j < \rho$. Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{F}$ is μ-e.d and let $B_\alpha \in [A_\alpha]^{<\mu}$ be such that $\{A_\alpha \setminus B_\alpha : \alpha < \rho\}$ is disjoint. Let $\theta(\alpha)$ be the lease cardinal in C such that $|B_\alpha| \leq \theta(\alpha)$. As $\mathrm{cf}\rho > |C|$, there is $W \in [\rho]^\rho$ and a fixed $\theta \in C$ such that $|B_\alpha| \leq \theta$ for all $\alpha \in W$. By the choice of f, there are $\alpha < \beta \in W$ such that $f(\alpha, \beta) > 2\theta$, hence $(A_a \setminus B_\alpha) \cap (A_\beta \setminus B_\beta) \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. $\square$

We show that for some assignment of $\nu_{\alpha,\beta} < \mu$, every μ^+-uniform family which realized it is not e.d.

Todorčević [25] proved $\omega_1 \not\to [\omega_1]^2_{\aleph_1}$ and Shelah [20] generalized this to $\lambda \not\to [\lambda]^2_\lambda$ for all regular λ with a non-reflecting stationary subset, which holds in particular for all successors of regulars. So for these cardinals λ it holds that $\lambda \not\to [\lambda]^2_\kappa$ for every $1 < \kappa \leq \lambda$.

5. Colorings of graphs

A graph G is a pair (V, E) where $V \neq \emptyset$ is the set of vertices and $E \subseteq [V]^2$ is the set of edges. The *list-chromatic* number $\chi_\ell(G)$ of a graph G is the smallest cardinal κ such that for every assignment of lists $L(v)$, each of cardinality $\geq \kappa$, to all vertices of G there is a proper coloring c of G with $c(v) \in L(v)$ for all $v \in V$. The *coloring number* of G is the smallest cardinal κ such that there exists a well-ordering $\prec$ of V with the property that $|\{u : u \prec v \wedge \{u, v\} \in E\}| < \kappa$ for every $v \in V$.

List-chromatic numbers were introduced independently by Vizing [26] and Erdős, Rubin and Taylor [4]. Coloring numbers were introduced by Erdős and Hajnal [3] following a suggestion of Rado. Alon [1] proved that $\chi_\ell(G) \geq (\frac{1}{2} - o(1)) \log_2 \mathrm{Col}(G)$ for every finite graph G. In the class of bipartite graphs the coloring number has no upper bound, whereas the chromatic number is always 2, so there is no function in the chromatic number of a graph which bounds the coloring number.

Erdős and Hajnal proved in [3] :

Theorem. *For every finite $n > 0$ and infinite ρ, every graph which does not contain a copy of $K(n, \rho^+)$ has coloring number $\leq \rho$.*

As $\chi(G) \leq \mathrm{Col}(G)$, and graph with uncountable chromatic number contains $K(n, \aleph_1)$ for all n and in particular contais a copy of $C_4 = K(2,2)$. The corollary of the Erdős-Hajnal theorem is more frequently quoted that the full formulation, and was surprising at the time, since earlier results of Erdős and Hajnal had shown that a graph could omit all cycles of length less than a prescribed k and have an infinite chromatic number.

Theorem 5.1. *For every cardinal ν and $\rho \geq \mu := \beth_\omega(\nu)$, every graph which does not contain a copy of $K(\nu, \rho^+)$ has coloring number $\leq \rho$.*

Proof. Given any graph $G = (V, E)$ let $F : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{P}(V)$ be defined by $F(X) = \bigcap_{v \in X} G[v]$ where $G[v] = \{u : \{v, u\} \in E\}$. This is an anti-monotone function and if there is no $K(\nu, \rho^+)$ then $|F(X)| \leq \rho$ for all $X \in [V]^\nu$.

We prove that $\mathrm{Col}(G) \leq \rho$ by induction on $\lambda = |V|$. For $\lambda \leq \rho$ there is nothing to prove. If $\lambda > \rho$ then by 3.9 there is a partition $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda\}$ of V such that $|D_\alpha| < \lambda$ and $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} D_\beta$ is F_μ-closed for all $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$. Consequently, for $v \in D_\alpha$,

$$|G[v] \cap \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} D_\beta| < \mu \tag{19}$$

By the induction hypothesis there is a well-ordering $\prec_\alpha$ on D_α such that

$$|G[v] \cap \{u : u \in D_\alpha \wedge u \prec_\alpha [v]\}| < \mu. \tag{20}$$

Define an ordering $\prec$ on V by letting $u \prec v$ if u, v belong to the same D_α and $u \prec_\alpha v$ or if $u \in D_\beta$, $v \in D_\alpha$ and $\alpha < \beta$. This is a well-ordering and $|G[v] \cap \{u : u \prec v\}| < \mu$ by (19) and (20). □

5.1. **List-chromatic and coloring numbers.** Komjáth [17] proved that for every $\alpha > 0$ it is consistent that $2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_\alpha$ and every graph G of size $\aleph_\alpha$ with $\chi(G) \leq \aleph_0$ has $\chi_\ell(G) \leq \aleph_0$. Thus, for arbitrarily large α it is consistent that the complete bipartite graph $K(\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_\alpha)$ has countable list-chromatic number. As $\mathrm{Col}(K(\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_\alpha)) = \aleph_\alpha$, there is no function f for which it is provable that $\mathrm{Col}(G) \leq \aleph_{f(\alpha)}$ for all G with $\chi_\ell(G) \leq \aleph_\alpha$.

On the other hand, $\chi_\ell(K(\kappa, 2^\kappa)) = \kappa^+$ for every infinite cardinal κ (see [17]), so the list chromatic number of $K(\kappa, \kappa)$ is larget than $\log \kappa$.

Alon asked if there was a function f from cardinals to cardinals which satisfies $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le f(\chi_\ell(G))$ for every graph G. For finite list-chromatic numbers an exponential function f is gotten from the conjunction of Alon's theorem with [3] provides such a function: suppose that G is infinite and $\chi_\ell(G) = n < \aleph_0$ then by Alon's [1] every finite subgraph G' of G satisfies $\mathrm{Col}(G') \le m$ for some $m \le (4 + o(1))2^{\chi_\ell(G)}$. Erdős and Hajnal [3] proved that for every graph G, if every finite subgraph of G has coloring number at most n, for fixed $n < \aleph_0$, then $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le 2(m-1)$, so it follows that $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le 2(m-1)$.

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose μ is a strong limit cardinal. For every graph G*

$$\mathrm{Col}(G) \le \beth_\omega(\chi_\ell(G)).$$

Proof. Let G be given and assume $\chi_\ell(G) = \nu \ge \aleph_0$. As $\chi_\ell(\nu, 2^\nu) = \nu^+$ the graph G is $K(\nu, 2^\mu)$-free. By 5.1 it holds that $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le \mu$. ☐

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose ν is infinite and $\mu = \beth_\omega(\nu)$. For every graph G:*

1. *If every subgraph $G' \le G$ of cardinality ν^+ satisfies* $\mathrm{Col}(G') \le \nu$ *then* $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le \mu$.
2. *If every subgraph $G' \le G$ of cardinality 2^ν satisfies $\chi_\ell(G') \le \nu$ then* $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le \mu$.

Proof. The complete bipartite graph $K(\nu, \nu^+)$ satisfies $\mathrm{Col}(K(\nu, \nu^+)) = \nu^+$. So if every subgraph of G of size ν^+ has coloring number μ, the graph G omits $K(\nu, \nu^+)$, and hence $\mathrm{Col}(G) \le \mu$. This proves (1), and (2) is similar, by $\chi_\ell(K(\nu, 2^\nu)) = \nu^+$. ☐

Acknowledgments I am grateful to N. Alon for his question and for listening patiently to the proof and to A. Hajnal for suggesting to apply the same methods to families of sets.

Most of the research presented here was done when I was a member at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton during 2010-11. I thank the IAS for the wonderful conditions it provides to its members.

References

[1] N. Alon. *Degrees and choice numbers*. Random Structures Algorithms 16 (2000), no. 4, 364–368.

[2] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal. *On a property of families of sets*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung., 12,(1961) 87-124

[3] P. Erdős and A. Hajnal. *On the chromatic number of graphs and set-systems*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung., 17,(1966) 159-229

[4] P. Erdős, A. Rubin and H. Taylor. *Choosability in graphs*. Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing (Humboldt State Univ., Arcata, Calif., 1979), pp. 125–157, Congress. Numer., XXVI, Utilitas Math., Winnipeg, Man., 1980.

[5] M. Gitik. *No bound for the first fixed point*. J. Math. Log. 5 (2005), no. 2, 193246.

[6] M. Gitik. *Short Extenders Forcing II*. preprint.

[7] M. Gitik and M. Magidor. *Extender based forcings*. JSL 59, 450-460(1994)

[8] M. Gitik and S. Shelah. em On certain indestructibility of strong cardinals and a question of Hajnal. Arch. Math. Logic 28, 35-42(1989)

[9] M. Gitik and S. Shelah. *On some configurations related to the Shelah weak hypothesis.* Arch. Math. Logic 40 (2001), no. 8, 639650.

[10] A. Hajnal, I juhász and S. Shelah. *Splitting strongly almost disjoint families.* Tans. AMS. 295 (1986) pp. 369–387.

[11] A. Hajnal, I. Juhász, L. Soukup and Z. Szentmiló ssy. *Conflict free colorings of (strongly) almost disjoint set-systems.* Acta Math. Hungar. 131(2011), Pages 230-274

[12] G. Hoffmann and P. Komjáth. *The transversal property implies property B* Periodica Math. Hung., 7 (1976), 179–181.

[13] P. Komjáth. *Dense systems of almost-disjoint sets.* Finite and infinite sets, (Eger, 1981), 527536, Coll Math Soc. J. Bolyai, 10, 1984. komdense

[14] P. Komjáth. *Families close to disjoint ones.* Acta Math. Hungar. 43 (1984), pp 199207.

[15] P. Komjáth. *Comparing almost-disjoint families.* Acta Math. Hung. 47 (1986), 321–323.

[16] P. Komjáth. *Conflict free colorings of nonuniform systems of infinite sets.* Acta Math. Hungar. 133(2011), 4, pp 305-310.

[17] P. Komjáth. *The list-chromatic number of infinite graphs.* preprint.

[18] E. W. Miller. *On a property of families of sets.* Comptes Rendus Varsovie, 30, (1937), pp 31-38.

[19] S. Shelah: A compactness theorem in singular cardinals, free algebras, Whitehead problem and transversals, Israel Journal of Mathematics, 21 (1975), pp 319349.

[20] S. Shelah. *Was Sierpiski right? I.* Israel J. Math. 62 (1988), no. 3, 355380.

[21] S. Shelah. *More on Cardinal Arithmetic.* Archive for Math Logic 32 (1993) 399-428

[22] S. Shelah *Cardinal Arithmetic.* Oxford University Press, 1994.

[23] S. Shelah. *The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited.* Israel J. Math. 116 (1998) pp 285-321.

[24] A. Tarski. *Sur la décomposition des ensembles en sous ensembles presque disjoint.* Fundamenta Math., I4 (1929), pp. 205-215.

[25] S. Todorčević. *Partitioning pairs of countable ordinals.* Acta Math. 159 (1987), no. 3-4, 261294.

[26] V. G. Vizing. *Coloring the vertices of a graph in prescribed colors.* (in Russian), Diskret. Analiz. No. 29, Metody Diskret. Anal. v. Teorii Kodov i Shem 101 (1976), 3-10.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, P.O.B. 653, 62QYOR BE'ER SHEVA, 84105 ISRAEL
E-mail address: `kojman@math.bgu.ac.il`